



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/434,268	11/05/1999	DERMOT TIMOTHY O'BRIEN	JA999-716	3752

7590

08/28/2003

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION
ALMADEN RESEARCH CENTER
650 HARRY ROAD
SAN JOSE, CA 95120

EXAMINER

SINGH, RACHNA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/434,268

Applicant(s)

O'BRIEN, DERMOT TIMOTHY

Examiner

Rachna Singh

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: application filed 11/06/99.
2. Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 8, 12, and 18 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkett et al., US Patent 6,476,828 B1, 11/5/02 (filed 5/28/99) in view of Betawar et al., US Patent 6,415,193 B1, 7/2/02 (filed 7/8/99).

In reference to claim 1, Burkett teaches a system for building and displaying dynamic graphical user interfaces comprising the following:

- Matching a selected data group with a layout to dynamically construct a GUI by combining a data group with a layout. See column 8. Compare to ***“representing a text file as a Graphical User Interface (GUI) . . .”***
- Rendering data items from the XML file within the GUI display space. See columns 9-10 and figures 13A and 13B. A means where data within the GUI can be changed dynamically by the user. In incorporating the XML data items within the GUI, the system is allowing users to enter

information in fields and sub-fields (for attributes). See column 1 and figures 6A-6F, 13A-13B, and 15. Compare to “**. . . GUI having parameter fields, and for each parameter field, having one or more attribute sub-fields, each of said sub-fields being text editable;**”.

- Storing changes made to the XML file via the GUI. See column 4.

Compare to “**storing attribute text entered in any sub-field to a data store**”.

Burkett teaches a dynamic graphical user interface derived from an XML data group. He does not specifically state creating a text file of parameter meta data even though the XML data group implies a file of data; however, Betawar teaches a system for editing parameter-level information in a semiconductor-manufacturing environment. In Betawar's system, a R-DOM (recipe distributed object model) is generated for a recipe-file format that is later presented in a editor in which a user may edit various parameters. Betawar's system illustrates the idea of creating a text file of parameter meta data in his use of a DOM. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Betawar's text file creation with Burkett's dynamic GUI since both are concerned with parameter modification in a template/editor or GUI. See abstract of both Betawar and Burkett. Moreover, Burkett teaches the use of a “data group” which could be interpreted as a “text file”.

In reference to claim 2, Burkett teaches generating a GUI based on an XML data group. He does not specifically state "text file"; however, Betawar teaches creating a text file from a DOM to convert the recipes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Betawar's creation of the text file with Burkett's use of XML since an XML parser reads XML files to generate a DOM tree. See column 4 of Burkett.

In reference to claim 3, Burkett does not teach using a URI; however, Betawar teaches using a system where the text file is in a database format. Since a URI is used to specify addresses and names of objects, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize a URI in storing the text entered by the user since Betawar already teaches storing the text file in a database. See column 15, lines 30-40.

In reference to claim 4, Burkett's system teaches incorporating the data group into the GUI. See rejections for claim 1 above.

In reference to claim 5, Burkett teaches the use of Java code for carrying out the operations. See column 4, lines 54-65.

In reference to claim 6, Burkett does not teach calling a subset of a text file corresponding to a parameter; however, Betawar teaches calling a subset of a file based on user security or parameter-level security levels. Thus he teaches calling a subset based on the access-level. See abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to call only a subset as taught by

Betawar in the system of Burkett since both are of analogous art in dealing with editing parameters in a GUI/editor.

Claims 12-17 are rejected under the same rationale used in claims 1-6 above respectively.

In reference to claim 7, Burkett teaches a system for building and displaying dynamic graphical user interfaces comprising the following:

- Matching a selected data group with a layout to dynamically construct a GUI by combining a data group with a layout. See column 8. Compare to ***“representing a text file as a Graphical User Interface (GUI) . . .”***
- Rendering data items from the XML file within the GUI display space. See columns 9-10 and figures 13A and 13B. A means where data within the GUI can be changed dynamically by the user. In incorporating the XML data items within the GUI, the system is allowing users to enter information in fields and sub-fields (for attributes). See column 1 and figures 6A-6F, 13A-13B, and 15. Compare to ***“. . . GUI having parameter fields, and for each parameter field, having one or more attribute sub-fields, each of said sub-fields being text editable;”***.
- Storing changes made to the XML file via the GUI. See column 4. Compare to ***“storing attribute text entered in any sub-field to a data store”***.

Burkett teaches a dynamic graphical user interface derived from an XML data group. He does not specifically state creating a text file of parameter meta data even

though the XML data group implies a file of data; however, Betawar teaches a system for editing parameter-level information in a semiconductor-manufacturing environment. In Betawar's system, a R-DOM (recipe distributed object model) is generated for a recipe-file format that is later presented in a editor in which a user may edit various parameters. Betawar's system illustrates the idea of creating a text file of parameter meta data in his use of a DOM. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Betawar's text file creation with Burkett's dynamic GUI since both are concerned with parameter modification in a template/editor or GUI. See abstract of both Betawar and Burkett. Moreover, Burkett teaches the use of a "data group" which could be interpreted as a "text file". Burkett teaches generating a GUI based on an XML data group. He does not specifically state "text file"; however, Betawar teaches creating a text file from a DOM to convert the recipes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Betawar's creation of the text file with Burkett's use of XML since an XML parser reads XML files to generate a DOM tree. See column 4 of Burkett. Burkett teaches the use of Java code for carrying out the operations. See column 4, lines 54-65. Burkett does not teach calling a subset of a text file corresponding to a parameter; however, Betawar teaches calling a subset of a file based on user security or parameter-level security levels. Thus he teaches calling a subset based on the access-level. See abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to call only a subset as taught by Betawar in the system of Burkett since both are of analogous art in dealing with editing parameters in a GUI/editor.

Claim 8 is rejected under the same rationale used in claim 1 above and further in view of the following comments. Burkett teaches that the invention may be embodied as a data processing system in the form of an entirely hardware embodiment or software embodiment or combination of the two. Thus utilizing a client/server system would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention since Burkett suggest the use of various embodiments.

Claims 9-11 are rejected under the same rationale used above in reference to claims 2-5 respectively.

Claim 18 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 above.

Claims 19-21 are rejected under the same rationale used above in reference to claims 2-5 respectively.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bernardo et al. US 6,308,188 B1 10/23/01 (filed 6/19/98)

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh at 703.305.1952. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached at 703.305.9792.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is 703.305.3900.

Application/Control Number: 09/434,268
Art Unit: 2176

Page 8

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

After-Final	703.746.7238
Official	703.746.7239
Non-Official/Draft	703.746.7240

Hand-Delivered responses should be brought to Crystal park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Rachna Singh
August 21, 2003



**SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER**